





## NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

26

Society—lump upon every human being not American in this country—man, woman, and child, who may hear it read, and can understand its import. The effect will be one of unbounded indignation, distrust, and astonishment.

Mr. Douglass, a negro gentleman, some time since complained of the treatment he had experienced from citizens of the United States, because of his color. This proceeding on his part is described by an American writer in the *New York Globe*—

"Frederick Douglass, the impudent negro who has of late taken on himself the privilege of abusing our country, its patriots and constitution, without having that chastisement he so richly merited at the hands of our republicans, who would not condescend to notice his blasphemy and negroism, had the audacity yesterday morning to walk down Broadway, the principal promenade of our city, with two white women on his arms. It is however apparent that the dread of the dreadful and blighting consequences that might befall the whole American population produced the marvellous effect above described. The citizens, though deeply moved, took no notice of the blasphemy and negroism. But there are limits to human patience. Bad as may be the making a just complaint by a negro against a white man, black atrocity can go further, although white imagination can hardly, in American phrase, realize the atrocity. What is this abominable offence? The patience of the citizens, the noble superhuman forbearance, at length gave way, and the mode of proceeding consequent upon this venial succumbing of white virtue is eminently characteristic; and is, indeed, a touching evidence of the delicacy and refinement of the high-minded white man, even in the very fury and paroxysm of his passion. Several citizens who noticed this disgraceful scene (viz. of the quiet unoffending negro, walking with two white women, who willingly walked with him) followed the impudent scamp to the additional office of laughing at the property of the white gentleman stepped up to the white ladies, and politely requested them to retire, and leave their ebony companion, and place themselves under the protection of a (white) gentleman standing by." The women obeyed; and the indignant and insulted (white) gentleman (to us the person really insulted was the black gentleman) administered a "dressing" to the negro; so severe, it appears, that he will not readily forget it. "Maddened justice," exclaims the editor, "forgets the dictates of law; and in this kind; and personally, we see no reason why it should not."

A few days since we published a letter, in which an Englishman described a case of still more atrocious wrong done to a respectable negro, who was forcibly seized by a band of armed men in the streets of Cincinnati during broad day, and carried off to a slave state. This violence, though producing to the individual more frightful evil than that of the insulted citizen of New York, is less significant of the popular feeling. We may suppose that the negro seized and carried to Kentucky was a runaway slave, and that the person who pursued him, and that the desire to obtain his property may have incited the owner to this deed of violence. But the feeling which led to the assault on Mr. Douglass was a general ungovernable sense of insult pervading a whole population at the sight of a negro man walking upon equal and familiar terms with white women. That the women were consenting to this intimacy is clear; that their being so was, in the opinion of the white gentlemen of New York, no justification for Mr. Douglass, is also evident; that such familiarity and equality could lead to so dangerous or mischievous consequence in the city or State of New York, every one must admit who knows the relative numbers of the white and black population of the State. In fact, blind, unreasoning antipathy was the cause of the outrage, and deemed by Americans a sufficient excuse for it. We in England, who happily have never been subjected to influences which could lead us to acts thus flagrantly opposed to the dictates of justice and benevolence, can hardly find words to express our astonishment as well as sorrow on witnessing so strange a distortion of the moral vision among a people justly celebrated for their sagacity, and for the fervor of their piety. We marvel indeed to see the dictates of a religion which they as well as ourselves believe and obey utterly forgotten when this wild and senseless antipathy comes into play; and we are irresistibly impelled to ask what command of morality or religion can be deemed sacred by these people, when those which result from the first principles of their faith, which are among the most imperative of those enforced by their laws, and sanctioned by the first precepts of their morality, are thus scouted and contemptuously neglected and opposed. The extraordinary increase of the wealth, population, and territory of the United States has raised her to the condition of a first-rate power among the nations of the world. She has also suddenly become smitten with a love of conquest, and we have now to learn whether she will allow this passion to dominate over all sense of right—whether, yielding to a lust of dominion, she will forget the dictates of justice, law, and reason, or whether, in obedience to the advice of the greatest of her sons, she will return to the wise precepts of his peaceful policy, and seek to be renowned for truth, wisdom, honesty, and benevolence.

From the London Inquirer.  
SIR HENRY BULWER, THE MODEL REPUBLIC,  
AND THE ENGLISH PRESS.

To the Editor:

Sir,—I have been given to understand that the sentiments of the *Examiner* on the subject of Anti-Slavery, remain such as they have been in my former period of its career; and I am not disposed to impeach the testimony on which I have been assured of that fact. Yet it may be thought by some that the occasion taken to appeal to those sentiments was not altogether inappropriately chosen, and that the editor, in publishing a speech by "SIR HENRY BULWER AT BALTIMORE," transferred from an American paper in the *Examiner* of May the 4th. In my anticipation that the bane and antidote might be permitted to go together, and that the impression made by that speech might be to some extent corrected, I was disappointed. But, as I continue to think the mischief of that effusion by no means slight, I venture to hope that the facility which has been denied by one portion of the press for exposing its evil tendency, will be conceded by another; and that through your fair and candid columns, it will be understood in America—by your insertion of the following letter—how at least some Englishmen think of such after-dinner flourishes, as that of Sir Henry Bulwer, among the free spirits of the slaveless city where "the beneficent whip" was never seen,—and the auction-block for men, women, and children was never known.

I remain, sir, yours, &c.,  
G. ARMSTRONG.

(Returned Letter to the Editor of the *Examiner*).  
Sir,—I think it was Erasmus who advised—"not to follow Truth too close at the heels, lest you may get your teeth knocked out for your pains." Nevertheless, I am willing to incur the risk of such recalcitration, in reminding the *Examiner*, of a truth which I once read in its pages with a great deal of satisfaction, and which even this day affects me, as I turn back to read it, as I am now doing.

It is an old story; but, like good wine, has if anything improved in the keeping. Here it is. It is in review of "Two Letters on Southern Slavery," addressed to Thomas Clarkson, by one Governor Hammond, of the United States. In the conclusion of that article in the *Examiner*, of September 13, 1846, the following "thoughts that breathe and words that burn" occur:

"When that dreadful hour of retribution shall arise—as come it must, one day from some dark quarter, if men like you perpetuate this system of atrocious inhumanity and wrong, this scandal to the truth and justice of mankind—may some scant grain of truth among the monstrous distortions of it, which are unblushingly put forth to shield the crime of trafficking in human life and liberty; some grateful recollection in the breast of an old slave for some old monetary kindness done preserve the door from that Red Sea, in which the host of characters whose cars are dragged by slaves through a false land assuming to be free, shall surely vanish from the earth!"

"Not to-day, O Lord!"

O not to-day!

But in the fulness of their blind resistance to the dictates of humanity and right, in the noon tide of this outrageous prostitution of the names of liberty and of religion; raise up their instruments of vengeance from among the lashed and miserable beings crouching at their feet, and strike them down with the accumulated wrath of generations!"

"I pray these of whom speaketh the prophet this?" Even the same concerning him, at a recent banquet in commemoration of the Pilgrim Fathers—refugees themselves in quest of liberty,—in Baltimore, too, the Capital, not of slaveholding only, but of slave-breeding and slave-exporting Maryland.—Victor, the representative, Sir Henry Bulwer, in manner and fashion of a 4th of July orator, is reported,—not without

signs of high approval on the hither as well as the further side of the great waters, to have descended thus: "A brighter and more real picture offered to his eye. The glorious spectacle of two great States . . . the same origin, in language, and above all in character, standing side by side, hand in hand, in the van of all mankind! the first wherein true glory was to be gained; justice and mercy to be vindicated! Commerce, civilization, and religion to be spread. The past hallowed their union, the future sanctified it. It was the union of one family, and had for its object the benefit of the whole world!"

This somewhat remarkable escapade is Sir Henry Bulwer's. The italics belong to me. And I make use of that expression to draw attention to the delicate figure very applied to this country by assimilating it in character and object with another whose merits are somewhat differently rated by one of her own greatest sons, in the ever-memorable words of President Jefferson—"I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; and that, in the revolution of the wheel of fortune, which is among possible events, the Almighty has no attribute which can side with us in such a contest!"

Sir, this compliment to England was paid by her representative in a Land where the following judicial definition has been given by a MAN, who, in being a slave, is accounted a traitor to his country, to live without knowledge and without capacity, to make any thing his own, and to toil that another may reap the fruits." It was spoken in a Land where "men are raised for the market like oxen for the shambles;" the same Jefferson being our authority on Nay, it was spoken in a city whose streets at that moment were witness of the "justice and mercy" belonging to a State, then, in 1829, described in the *Baltimore Reporter*, quoted by Theodore Parker, in "A Letter to the People of the United States, touching the matter of Slavery," now before me.—"Destiny slaves has become a large business, establishments are made in several places, in Maryland, at which they are sold like cattle; these places of deposit are strongly built, and well supplied with iron and thumb-screws and gags, and ornamented with cow-skins and other whips, often bloody." Finally, "it would never have occurred to the white ladies, that they would abolish Slavery, the Lord knows when, and the other, never," was pronounced in a Land associated with England, as "the van of all mankind," of which, Thomas Clarkson being witness, the great and good Lafayette often said to him, "I would never have drawn my sword in the cause of America, if I could have conceived that there by I was founding a land of Slavery."

These premises considered, are we not in a condition to ask,—might not good taste, if not good feeling, have reminded the representatives of the people as well as the slave, that the place of his language was as unhappily chosen, as the objects of his eulogy were travestied, rather than honored, by his ludicrously inappropriate praises?

I forbear to add more; prolixity is the theme you have given your readers,—in thoughts whether any one, whose social and political ground-work is essentially savage, can be entitled to a place, I do not say among free, but even among civilized communities; or whether the flag which waves over three millions of slaves can ever be the symbol of regeneration for any portion of God's suffering nations? Yet, what I have written, I trust will not be too much to warrant the hope that you will do justice to the former sentiments of the *Examiner* (sound as ever, we would not doubt, on the topic here treated,) as well as to the present sentiments of many a thinker in England, by the insertion of these few, however inadequate, comments on an incident far from unimportant.—Yours, very respectfully,  
G. ARMSTRONG.

Clifton, May 8th, 1850.

### National Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment—Without Compromise.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 11, 1850.

### PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

### NEW ENGLAND ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

[Photographic Report by Dr. Stone.]

CHOCICUTTA HALL, WEDNESDAY EVE'G, MAY 29.

SPEECH OF PARKER PILLBURY.

MR. PRESIDENT:

Boston has seen very many great days since her history first began, but never probably a greater day than this. It was a great day when the first blood was shed in State street, at the 'Boston Massacre.' That blood was the sowing of the dragon's teeth; the harvest was the American Revolution. It was a great day for Boston when a cargo of tea went overboard into the harbor, an indignant defiance of the unjust demand of British power.

Boston bore a conspicuous part in the Revolution of 1776. I predict a no less honorable part will be enacted by her in the revolution of the present day, a revolution that is designed to eclipse that of 1776, with all its brave and bloody scenes. And had we all our ancestors' love of liberty, instead of covering ourselves with reproach and shame by clamoring and hissing down a meeting like this, we should be making for ourselves a most honorable place in the history of our age and nation; for we might act a part that should bathe the sunset of our existence in halos of resplendent glory. And I apprehend, that were we all able to appreciate the enterprise in which we are engaged, had we all capacity sufficient to grasp the sublime scenes through which we are now passing, (in which some of us are trying to act an humble part,) there would be no occasion to call in the police to keep order in a meeting of this description. But it is because we have been so educated, we have so long been trained under the religious and political influences that have scourged and cursed our country and our age, that we find ourselves—some of us—at this time, so sunk, so degraded in the scale of being, that it becomes necessary to call in a police force, with authority to keep men in order who are capable of good behavior, only as the staff of the police officer is held in terror from their heads.

Now, I think it not very complimentary to the hundred churches of Boston and to the many schools, that it requires a police force to keep order in an Anti-Slavery meeting. It is because we have not been trained to act well our part in the scenes through which we are now passing—scenes which are giving grandeur and glory to the age in which we live—scenes which ere long will eclipse the brightest or bloodiest days of the American Revolution. I think if I were one of the one hundred clergymen of Boston, and it required a police force to keep order in such a meeting as this, I would resign my position, and ask the citizens to call in some more efficient instrumentality for the mental and moral culture of the people.

We are here to add our mite to the greatest revolution which the age has witnessed. The days of 1776 were indeed great days, but the glory of this latter revolution shall exceed the glory of the former.

I suppose that in that day, among those who are born of women, a greater did not arise than George Washington. Notwithstanding, I think he who is least in this dispensation, if fully baptized with its spirit, is greater than Washington, and will be remembered when the deeds of Washington, and all the brightest and most transcendent scenes of that dispensation shall have been forgotten. Nor is this my approach to them. God forbid that I should stand here to pluck one single laurel from the wreaths that entwined the brows of the great men who acted in that dread drama. But the time had not come then for men to appreciate liberty. The subject of human rights had not then been reduced to a science. Men only saw liberty "as trees walking." They planted their "Liberty Trees," and there was almost as much liberty in those trees, rooted in the rocky earth, as men were capable of appreciating it for one another, at that earlier period.

But the time has come when the eyes of the generations are beginning to be unshackled from the scales that darkened the vision of that day. Now we understand the science of human rights better. Now we are carrying on a revolution that shall realize all that was written in the Declaration of Independence. We are not making a revolutionary war only for the liberty of holding slaves. We shall not waste through seas of blood, and expend hundreds of millions of treasure, only to purchase for ourselves the liberty to enslave the children of our poor neighbors. That dispensation is passing away, and a new and brighter is dawning upon the world. I only wish the present race were to a man capable of appreciating the sublimity and the grandeur of the scenes through which we are now passing.

Upas orchards of Slavery.

I suppose you think, who just now were hissing and howling, that had you lived in the days of '76, you would have been patriots, you would have been the friends of American liberty. I beg to inform you that you possess and exhibit the spirit of the Tories of that time. [Cheers and groans.] I beg you to understand that they disposed of such as you in that day, by tying them up to the nearest tree. [Renewed approbation and disapprobation.] I beg you, who gave the three cheers for Zachary Taylor, to understand that General Washington ordered many such as you to be elevated to a position not very comfortable or complimentary. [Applause and hisses.]

Now, then, (though I would not by any means reproach even you, for I think more blame lies at the door of your religious and your moral teachers than at your own,) may it well be to remind you that you have not read carefully the history of that period and have unfortunately reckoned yourselves in the wrong category. You have supposed yourselves the friends of liberty, whereas you come into such a meeting as they used to have in Faneuil Hall, in the outset of the Revolution, and clamor, or try to clamor such a meeting down. There were those who clamored and hissed in those days, and who thought that Washington, Adams and Hancock were very great fools and fanatics, as well as traitors. And if there were in that day any *New York Herald*, (which God forbid,) or *Boston Bee*, or *Times*—and there is a paper which some say (slandrously, I trust) is even worse than these—I mean the *Boston Herald*. [Three cheers for the *Herald*.] Very well, every one to his taste, and in his own vernacular. [Laughter.] If there were such papers as these in revolutionary times, (just the things now to hang in Kimball's Museum,) they were doubtless branding the American patriots as traitors who ought to be hissed, booed and lunged; and if there were women who could make catridges for their husbands to fire at the enemy, women, whose luxury it was to go without the enjoyment of tea,—suppose there were *Posts* and *Mails* that could talk about the 'Aunt Nabbies,' and 'Abby Kelley Folsoms,' who would be better at home mending their stockings? I do not know that there were such; there might have been—we have them now.

I was remarking that those who clamor down the cause of freedom now, would have done the same then; and if you choose to occupy a position like that, I do not envy you their choice.

The reason why this is such a great day for Boston is, that there is such a spirit waking up among the people that it is necessary for the enemies to this manifest their displeasure. The time has come when the ear of the people of Boston is again open. What have we seen to-day? The most eminent clergymen, the most popular editors, the most distinguished professional gentlemen of every description, thronging the Melodeon, listening hour after hour to the advocates of freedom, and listening with an attention so profound as that it required no very annotated eye to see that the Genius of Liberty was hovering over that mighty assembly, and that the rustle of his wings was fanning into a glowing flame the few sparks of love of liberty and justice that still glimmered upon the altars of so many souls, where the fires of freedom had almost been extinguished. [Prolonged applause.] I say it was glorious to witness such a glowing demonstration. And it was so glorious, that I even looked upon the disapprobation with a high satisfaction; for I knew it would not have been manifested, but for the majestic display on the other side of the long-slumbering spirit of justice and freedom.

It is a great day for Boston, when the Beechers and the Buckinghams, the Streeters, the Vintons, and the Ballous, and the clergy in multitude, of high as well as of low degree, through the Anti-Slavery meeting, and hour after hour, instead of reclining upon their damask couches, as at home or in their own pulpits, could stand on their feet in our rude aisles, the whole half day together, apparently with the most profound sensations of satisfaction and delight. And are these the young men to clamor down discussion which the very elite of your city listen to with such deep emotion? Why, young men, you have forgotten yourselves! You will not do that again. I could not help exclaiming—"Father, forgive them; they know not what they do!"

It is a great day for Boston—and yet it is a day when it becomes us to review the past. I could not but think, this afternoon, what our nation had been doing for the last twenty years. I ran my eye back to 1830. It was that millennial season, when the Spirit of God, so the Church called it, came down as in Pentecost, like a rushing mighty wind; and when from Berkshire to Barnstable, and from the Atlantic to the waters of the Mississippi, the whole land was redolent with 'revivals,' and the clergy and the church exclaimed, 'The wilderness and the solitary places are blossoming like the rose, and the desert is shouting for joy!' And the ministry thought they saw the rising sun of millennial glory. I was an humble actor in those scenes. I lent the little influence I had, though scarcely more than arrived at manhood, to carry on what seemed to me the final victories of the triumphing Church; and the sinners, as they were termed, were found flocking in crowds to the 'inquiry meeting,' and from thence to more sacramental scenes. Then was the day when the ways of Zion no longer mourned; for the multitude flew as doves to their windows, into the ark of salvation. And the church lived a whole eternity of joy in its bright and prophetic contemplation.

That was the history of ten years, from 1830 to 1840. Such a season the world has never witnessed. Never did the Church so strengthen itself. But what was the history of the succeeding ten years? The church had grown stronger. She had planted the banner of the cross in almost every village and hamlet this side the Rocky Mountains. There was a glorious triumphing of American religion. There was a mighty gathering to the American Church. The Gospel, as it came from the American pulpit, seemed clothed with power divine. The lips of the ministry seemed touched as with a live coal from off the altar of God. And yet, what was the history of the ensuing ten years? Did the church, rejoicing in her triumphs, go forth to plant Edens and bright oases over the black Sahara desert of our land, where intertemperance and Slavery have clothed it with sorrow, and the hearts of thousands were wrung at all the forms of varied vice? Did the fountains of iniquity which flowed forth from the revolutionary war and the war of 1812, now, under the influence of the Church, become assuaged or dried up? How was it? Was there among the slaves of the South a jubilee proclaimed, a fiftieth year jubilee, or a seventh year jubilee? Did you read or learn of any such? Did the Indians—the Cherokees, the Creeks, or the Seminoles—receive the gospel of peace, and become civilized under the revivals of that day?

We are looking at the history of the last ten years, from 1850 back to 1840. Have you been attentive observers of these events? Because, if so, you are prepared to look at this investigation for a moment. Now, then, I ask this audience, I ask especially the religious portion of the audience, in the popular sense of the word, I ask the ministry, and whoever may represent American religion, what are, what have been, the facts of that 'Pentecostal season,' which went over our land from 1830 to 1840? What blessings flowed to man? I stand here to affirm, that the ten succeeding years were marked with instances of depravity, were stained with scenes of blood, were filled with outrage and injustice, for which the whole history of the past furnishes no parallel whatsoever. With all our revivals, with all our gatherings into the Church, you did not prepare this nation to commence a system of plunder, by the seizure and annexation of Texas—which has resulted in a war of conquest which has doubled the territory of the United States, and doubled it, too, for purposes that ought not to be whispered in the darkest streets or lanes of hell. You have seized and appropriated to yourselves territory, the owners of which you had drowned in their own blood, and buried beneath the ashes of their own dwellings, that you might plant on that soil, not the tree of liberty, but the

Such is the result of the ten years of millennial triumph in the American Church. I ask the religious portion of this audience again, what complaint does that pay to American religion? Will you tell me it was not that religion that was responsible? I again was not, then, the whole American pulpit to this platform, and from its mouth I will prove that that pulpit alone had power to arrest these terrible proceedings, and stay this hand of violence that has covered our land with guilt, and Mexico with mourning and woe. I say, it is the fruit of those revivals; and it is just that fruit which American religion ever will produce.

Now, just look a moment at particulars in reference to this question of whether the Church had ought to do in this matter. Where was the voice of effectual rebuke from the pulpit? How many ministers were driven from their parishes as a consequence of fidelity in this matter? One man in Newbury was faithful, but was banished from his pulpit, and it was told over the land as a wonder. And it was a wonder? The pulpit generally was either silent, or the zealous advocate of the whole transaction. And after all the bloody scenes had been enacted, after what you had sent thousands of Mexicans, unbidden, and perhaps unprepared, to judgment, after you had appropriated their soil to yourselves, the three great political parties sat down in council together to inquire, What shall we do with the stolen property? what shall we do with the plunder? [A loud discharge of crackers occurred in Phillips's place, considerably disturbing the meeting.]

There, friends, do you hear that dread artillery? Is not the Church safe? With Professor Stuart at Andover, and with Professor Street's India Cracker auxiliaries in Boston, why, the Church were cowardly indeed not to feel safe. Who is not on the Lord's side?

But I was speaking of the events that followed the conquest of Mexico, when the three political parties sat down in council, to inquire what they should do with the stolen property. Neither party pleaded guilt or crime, with reference to the means by which they had acquired the property. We had confounded these little moral distinctions, so that not even the Free Soil party doubted but that we had come very honestly by it. To be sure, thousands of Mexicans lay dead. To be sure, we had seized by force California and New Mexico. But I think our Free Soil friends thought it need not be, should not be returned.

A Voice—Palfrey would to return it.  
Mr. Pillsbury—Neither party thought it was unjust or improper to hold on to the territory. All three knew gold had been gained, and gain was golden.

Now then where was the innocent Church, while the throats of a hundred cannon were roaring out on Boston Common the nation's joy at the victories achieved by the success of American valor? Did she not scamper to her sanctuaries, and there thank God that *Mexico was open to the Gospel*?

And has she not been thanking God ever since?—Has not the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church already established a Synod there? And the other day, when they came together in Philadelphia, behold all this new territory was represented! The Presbyterian Church was thanking God that new missionary fields were opened, and that now the blessings of the gospel of Protestant salvation would be extended over that country, where Catholicism in 1840 abolished Slavery, and where American Protestantism had conquered the territory and murdered the inhabitants in order again to establish Slavery. There was the American Church. These revivals prepared men for sins they were ill prepared for before; which before they would hardly have committed.

Yes, Mr. President, I stand here to give it as my opinion,—though I was a blind participant in those scenes,—I stand here to give it as my opinion, that without those revivals to stupefy the heads of the American people, and to fill the hearts of the American Church with love of their God, and hatred of their fellow-men, the Mexican conquest never could have been achieved. [Applause and hisses.] Somebody hissed at that! If you had been an Anti-Slavery agent three months, you would have been satisfied of its truth. Your religion is of such a character, that the more you have of it, the more like devils you become.

The moment there is a revival of religion, that moment the cause of humanity takes its flight. I tested that in Springfield and other places. I was there holding meetings. They told me the Baptist Church had a revival; and as I was at leisure one evening, I went into a revival meeting. It was an assembly almost as large as this, because it occupied a larger room, though the building was not as full. The minister read a psalm, and then he prayed. Then they sang another psalm, and then one of the deacons prayed. Then he called on another of the deacons for remarks. There was very little to say, and as there seemed a disposition to hear, I thought perhaps I might be the right speaker. [Laughter.]

I rose up, and commenced in as serious and becoming a tone as I could, some remarks in reference to the present condition and character of the Baptist Church. I began to tell them of the part the Baptist Church had acted in the conquest of Mexico. I told them a little about the fact that the Baptist Church had in half the States of this Union annihilated marriage utterly, the institution on which humanity depends for the little happiness there is left in the world. Marriage, the only type of Eden that was saved amid the ruins of the fall, I told them it was utterly struck down in half the Baptist Churches of this Union, and there is no marriage there. You have 125,000 slaves to whom that sacred institution is utterly denied, converting your Churches into immense brothels, and more deserving the name than the brothels of our city for at least two reasons. For your Churches in the South have discussed the question and have decided in the Shiloh Associations, in the Savannah River Association, and in some others, that it is right, in the sight of God, thus to trample marriage in the dust. And for that one reason, your Church is worse than the house of ill-fame in Boston or New York. [Hisses.] For horrible as is the shame of those places, they never draw the Almighty down from his throne, and make him sign approval to their disgusting outrages. [Hisses.]

And then there is one thing more why the Baptist Churches ought to be considered worse than the houses of ill-fame in our cities; and that is, that in these common houses of ill-fame, [groans,] nobody is compelled to remain. [Hisses.] Do you hiss that? But the Magdalen Societies, the Female Moral Reform Societies, send their agents to go and stand like the angels who led Lot out of Sodom—to go and stand at the doors of those houses, and conduct the penitent and sorrowing from their infamy, and bid them welcome again back to the bosom of affection, to the domestic fireside, and to all the sweets of pure and happy love. [Applause.] But, said I, is there any Female Moral Reform Society that can go to the doors of the Baptist Churches, and take these 125,000 victims out from the scenes through which they are compelled to pass.

Well, I had only got so far, [laughter,] when one of the deacons rose up and said—"The gentleman appears to be a stranger here. He probably does not know the state of things." Now, said he, I must inform him that we are in the midst of a revival. We have been praying three months for a revival, and God has at length heard our poor prayers, has come down, and is saving sinners, and we do not wish to have our attention turned off to foreign, and to us, at this time, unimportant subjects."

I said to the audience, and then walked away, "Do you not see that you have a religion here, which the more you have it, the worse you become? For it appears, from your own showing, that were there no revival here, you could listen to these declarations of mine."

And now let me say, that ten years of that kind of revival prepared the American people to deluge Mexico in the blood of eighty thousand people, and then to steal the country, so that they might again plant there the infernal slave system.

the credit of allowing more free speech than most Baptists churches, so far as you have become acquainted with them? [Hurrahs near the door. Hear! hear!] Mr. Pillsbury—It seems to me that you must be thankful for very small favors to hurrah at that question. Did you take that gentleman's inquiry as any part of your defence? It is remarkable that there should have been such clamorous applause for so small favors. It makes me think of the story my friend James N. Buffum told, of what a man did in order to break a young colt. To prevent him from being easily startled, he got a boy to halloo to him as he rode by. As he reached the spot, the boy rushed from his hiding place with a tremendous yell, which so frightened the animal that he threw his master headlong to the ground. Picking himself up slowly, he angrily asked the boy what he did that for, and was answered that he understood that he was ordered to make a noise. 'Yes,' said the man, 'but not to make such a great bo for such a little colt.' [Prolonged laughter, and cries of 'Question!'] Answer the question! I answer, I was heard better than usual.

Then another thing might be said: and that is, the very form of the question which you cheered so rapturously was a perfect indication, at least, that the Baptists churches generally are utterly hostile to free speech, and that it was only that particular church which tolerated free speech. I am therefore very much obliged to you for cheering our side, although I think our side can get on better than yours. [All huzzah! Hurrahs repeated.] Smallest favors gratefully received, again, as I told you.

I was speaking of the last ten years. The nation will yet be covered with the veil of repentance for their deeds, such as the world has not yet seen. I am talking longer than I ought to talk, and will bring my remarks to a speedy close. [Slight applause.]

I said in the outset, that this was a good day for Boston. It is so, finally, because the people are becoming wiser than their teachers. I tell you that when Daniel Webster is compelled to melt up the stereotype plates of his first edition, and to give us edition after edition of his speech, 'with additions and improvements,' and when Prof. Stuart, Andover Theological Seminary, Cambridge College, and Boston aristocracy, are compelled to come to the rescue of it and its author, it is indeed a wonderful sign of the times. Do you believe that a small matter would avail to call forth these four or half a dozen copies of this speech? Do you believe that a small matter would have been sufficient to rouse Prof. Stuart from a lethargy of almost natural as well as a long and lingering spiritual death, to defend the 'godlike' in such a dilemma? Do you believe there have been many occasions, where Cambridge College would have forgotten its dignity and what belonged to its propriety, so that the President should have volunteered his service; and that State street, too, should move to bolster up a speech, the first edition of which would have done honor to any devil whatever they took part in a Congress of 'devils damned!' [Cheers and groans.] It is indeed a sign of the times when Andover and Cambridge and State street and the Boston pulpit are all combined to hold up such a man, and such a cause.

I think that the present is a season when the friends of freedom have cause to rejoice. Who now makes a speech in Congress, what politician makes a speech out of Congress, that does not commence with anthems in glorification of the American Constitution and Union, and close with a doxology in long metre to the same? It seems to me that that demonstration is enough to fill the hearts of the friends of freedom. [Much stamping, noise and confusion. 'Order! order!'] See, too, how powerless is the opposition we encounter. A few days ago, in New York, the mob was sufficient to break up the meetings altogether. The *New York Herald* had but to cry 'Havoc,' and the *New York Globe* but to 'let slip the dogs of war,' and the Anti-Slavery meetings were broken up. But then you know Daniel Webster had given us but two or three editions of his speech, and the people were not aware into how deep an amount of infamy he had plunged. And so the mob had power. But now we have had more editions of that speech; State street and Professor Stuart have come to the rescue, and the humanity and sense of justice of the people is aroused, and Boston has exhibited a spectacle more sublime than she has presented since the days of 1776. And the power of the mob? Why, the God who shut the lions' mouths when the friends of justice and of liberty were to be sacrificed, seems to have appeared for the same glorious deliverance to-day, and truth, and humanity and justice triumph. The day is dawning, and will soon be shining in meridian splendor, when Andover will be gathered with Daniel Webster to a grave of infamy, and their history for the last twenty years will be written with mourning and sorrow, and read with an astonishment overwhelming. The day will soon burst upon our land, when liberty will be extended to the millions of our slaves—and from this land as a solar, central focus, its light and blessing shall radiate, until all the families and nations of the earth shall be baptized in its divine and sanctifying influence. [Prolonged applause. Three cheers for Daniel Webster.]

Whether the Resolution was passed by accident, or whether it was considered, as some suspicious people will think, that there were a hundred good reasons a dollar a piece for permitting its passage, does not positively appear. It is certain, however, that no sooner had Mr. Smith turned his back than the Treasurer of the Society discovered that the Resolution committed them further than they ought to go, and thereupon it was rescinded. We do not learn, however, that with the rescinding of the resolution, and the consequent retiring of Mr. Smith, that there was any returning of money. Mr. Smith wrote the Treasurer the following letter on learning the treatment given to his banding when the father was out of sight:

Mr. Abner Bates, Treasurer of N. Y. State Temperance Society.

DEAR SIR: I learn this afternoon, that the Society reconsidered and rescinded, yesterday, the 2d in the series of Resolutions, which it had passed. I have no doubt that it will be the gainer thereby, on the score of popularity, numbers and friends. Nevertheless, is not the favor of Heaven, at the expense of more than these purchases these gains, worth infinitely more than these? I can avoid the conclusion, that the Society has made a bad bargain, and exchanged its own self for a bad bargain.

When you asked for contributions, day before yesterday, I gave my name for \$100. Enclosed is my draft for it. This ends my connection with the Society. I say not this with the least idea that the Society will regret my withdrawal. No Society, which studies to keep in the current of the popular favor, covets the membership of one who does as myself.

Respectfully, your friend,  
GERRIT SMITH.

Petersboro', June 22, 1850.

### Death of General Taylor.

The announcement, in this city on Tuesday morning of the dangerous illness of the President caused a deep sensation, which was increased in the afternoon by the intelligence that there could be little doubt of its fatal termination. The public anxiety was relieved on Wednesday morning by the assurance of his death, which was received, by very many excellent, though not very profound people, with sincere sorrow, and as the announcement of a great public calamity.

Such language needs no comment. Had we seen it in a Brazilian Temperance paper, it might not have surprised us. We cannot close this article, however, which we designed at first as a mere notice of an important action in a large Temperance organization, without vindicating the Church from a base aspersion. For the present it must not be noticed (why not?) that every organization like that of our Order, shall free itself from all the prejudices of custom, and be so far ahead even of the Church and the age.

Such language needs no comment. Had we seen it in a Brazilian Temperance paper, it might not have surprised us. We cannot close this article, however, which we designed at first as a mere notice of an important action in a large Temperance organization, without vindicating the Church from a base aspersion. For the present it must not be noticed (why not?) that every organization like that of our Order, shall free itself from all the prejudices of custom, and be so far ahead even of the Church and the age.

Such language needs no comment. Had we seen it in a Brazilian Temperance paper, it might not have surprised us.



To us there is one which may not perhaps be generally dwelt upon; namely, that the judgment of God seems to rest upon the Whig party and its doctrine of availability. Its successful and available candidates are sure to live, while its unavailable and unsuccessful candidates are sure never to die.

**COLONIZATION vs. THE SLAVE TRADE.**—Governor Roberts of Liberia has sent to the Secretary of the American Colonization Society the following letter, which the newspapers are everywhere publishing as gratifying intelligence of the final extinction of the Slave Trade. Of course, they all know, if they know anything about the matter, that this purchase of Roberts will not lessen by one child the exportation of African slaves, and that the only object of the publication of the letter is to aid in bringing into favor again the Slaveholders' darling scheme of getting rid of free negroes and fortifying Slavery. The rampant pro-slavery spirit of the day has given that scheme new, but we trust only spasmodic life, and we copy the letter, not to show the method it resorts to, and to put on record what will be proved to be a lie, so far as the Slave Trade is concerned within a twelve month.

**MONROVIA (Liberia), May 17, 1850.**  
DEAR SIR: I have just returned from the windward coast, and find here the United States brig Bainbridge, on the eve of sailing for the United States, via Porto Praya. Capt. Slaughter has been kind enough to allow me an hour of his time, and I have written you a hasty note, to say that we have at length succeeded in securing the famed territory of Gallinas to this Government, including all the territories between Cape Mount and Shebar, excepting a small slip of about five miles of coast in the Kellou country, which will soon fall into our hands.

For these tracts we have incurred a large debt, and we confidently look to you to aid us in meeting these liabilities at maturity. Had I not deemed it absolutely important to secure the Gallinas, to prevent the revival of the slave trade there, I would not have paid the price demanded. The purchase of Gallinas and the neighboring tracts will cost us about \$5,000. The chiefs were aware of the object of the purchase, and urged strenuously the sacrifices, as they consider, if they must make in abandoning for ever the slave trade, and demanded a large sum as an equivalent. In addition to the amount stated above, we have obligated ourselves to appoint commissioners immediately to settle the wars in the country, and open the trade in camwood, ivory and palm oil with the interior tribes; and also settle among them, as soon as convenient, persons capable of instructing them in the arts of husbandry. This will also cost a considerable sum, which no doubt will be returned in the end by the advantages the trade will give. Still the present outlay will be, I fear, more than equal to our ability.

The surgeon David C. Foster has arrived safely, and the emigrants, as far as I have learned, were landed in good health.

We have no further news worth communicating.  
Yours, in haste,  
J. J. ROBERTS.  
Rev. W. McLain, Washington.

HON. JOHN P. HALE will accept our thanks for a copy of valuable public documents.

### Domestic Correspondence.

LETTER FROM SAMUEL J. MAY.

DEAR FRIEND—I have spent the last two days in the Convention of the Liberty Party. It has been well attended by delegates from different parts of the State; but our citizens have been so much occupied with company, and their own plans for spending these holidays, that few have been seen in this Convention. The Resolutions and the Address, adopted by this meeting with great unanimity, will show you that the tone of Anti-Slavery sentiment is not lower at any point with the leading spirits of this expurgated Liberty Party than with the Abolitionists of the old organization. Could you have heard the discussions you would have often thought yourself in the midst of a New England Anti-Slavery Convention. The strongest condemnation was expressed of the false religion and spurious democracy that prevail in our country, and the standard of pure Christianity and of righteous civil government, was held high and with a firm grasp. Gerrit Smith's ideas of a true civil government differ very little from those opinions of Mr. Garrison, which have been so diplytically called "no government notions." The only very material difference between the new Liberty Party and the American Anti-Slavery Society seems to me to be in the interpretation they give to the Constitution of the United States. And this difference is not such as to affect the result at which the two bodies are aiming so much as the means by which they hope to reach that result. When we of the American Anti-Slavery Society have overthrown the present Constitution of our country, we shall labor to establish another government in harmony with the will of God, and the equal rights of man. And if Gerrit Smith and his co-workers could bring the people of this nation to put an Anti-Slavery construction upon the Constitution we now have, and procure such amendments as they think should be made in a few of its provisions—and wake up in the heart of the nation a supreme regard for that authority which they believe to be far higher than that of any instrument man can frame, what would be wanting to make our present Constitution in effect very much such a one as we would have framed if this were abolished?

I wonder that the members of the Liberty Party do not see, as you and I do, that the Constitution of our country was framed with the fixed determination to uphold the institutions of Slavery, that it has ever been so interpreted, and the government always so administered as to favor slaveholders, and that no one can take office under this Constitution without binding himself by an oath to do, or countenance others in doing, what every friend of impartial liberty must abhor. But wonder as I may, it is obvious enough that they do not see this matter as I do; and that they are as hearty and self-sacrificing as most of our associates in their endeavors to abolish Slavery.

The members of the Liberty Party are coming to perceive that they are not far apart in our aims and spirit; that they are not much less traitorous to the government of our country than we are; nor much, if any, less infidel to the current religion of the churches. The resolutions they have passed at this Convention, and the Address they have issued, will put them, we think, in the same category with Jackson, Phillips, and Garrison.

A fortnight ago we had a visit from Abby K. Foster. She gave an able address in our City Hall, and raised while here, in cash and pledges, about \$150. Gerrit Smith was one of her auditors. He expressed very strongly his approval of the sentiments she had uttered. He gave her \$5 on the spot, and moreover pledged himself to pay \$25 to sustain Charles C. Burleigh as a lecturer in this State, and to do as much for Mrs. Foster's support if she could come. These things are sufficiently indicative of his feelings towards us, and of his willingness to be identified with us in the regards of all pro-slavery men.

In the course of the Convention of this week, there has been considerable and profitable discussion on the province of civil government. Much, too, has been said upon the aid that may and should be given to those who would escape from the land of bondage.

In this last connection, we were exceedingly interested in an account given us by E. B. Crocker, Esq., from South Bend, Indiana, of the recent decision of Judge M'Lean in the case of Norris versus E. B. Crocker and others, for preventing the recovery of certain runaway slaves. According to his statement, Judge M'Lean's procedure was as unrighteous and base as it could be in the circumstances.

A number of colored persons were violently seized in Cass County, Michigan, and, without any warrant or certificate, were hurried off towards Kentucky. At South Bend, Indiana, their course was arrested by a writ of Habeas Corpus, and the colored persons were discharged by the Court, on the ground that they ought not to have been taken from Michigan without a certificate from some United States officer. The kidnappers and their lawyer foreseeing this result, were al-

ready provided with a warrant from the proper authority in Indiana, and immediately on hearing the decision of the court arrested their fugitives again, and threw them into jail. As soon as it could be done, they were again taken by writ of Habeas Corpus, and brought before the Court, that it might be there shown that they were free.

The kidnappers and their counsel now refused to appear. It was shown to the Court that the persons claimed had come into Indiana with the knowledge and consent of their master, and were therefore free. This plea, and the evidence in support of it, not being opposed, prevailed with the Court. The colored persons were pronounced free, and allowed to return to their home in Michigan.

Immediately the Kentucky kidnapper commenced, in the District Court of the United States, a suit against the lawyer, Mr. Crocker, the Sheriff, and six other persons of South Bend, for having prevented him from removing his property from Michigan. Judge M'Lean presided. The counsel for the defendants offered to show that the persons claimed as slaves had come into the State of Indiana with the knowledge and consent of the person who assumed to be their owner, and therefore were free to go where they pleased. But the Hon. Judge waived all such minor considerations, and charged the Jury that the writ of Habeas Corpus was not obtained from the proper authority, (the Judge of the State Court having no jurisdiction over such cases) that the whole procedure under that writ was consequently illegal, and the Lawyer who obtained it, the Sheriff who served it, and the persons who aided and abetted them, were liable to pay for the property which had been so taken from them. This was the charge. Mr. Crocker took us, although he and his counsel offered to prove that the persons in question were not the property of the plaintiff.

Moreover, the impartial, humane, and Christian Judge was not forgetful of his obligations to our blessed Union, but improved the occasion to plead the necessity of re-assuring our slaveholding brethren of our readiness to secure to them the enjoyment of their peculiar property, by visiting with condign punishment all unlawful interference with it.

The Jury had been well selected to do what the Judge indicated to them should be done. So they brought in \$2,008 damages, some three hundred more than were laid in the prosecution. The costs and expenses incident to the trial were somewhat more than \$2000. These friends of humanity in South Bend are therefore immersed in a debt of about five thousand dollars, for the sake of our glorious and happy Union. Several of them will be stripped of all their property to pay it. Never mind, they must be taught that Slavery is the "peculiar institution" which must be sustained though all things else are trampled under foot.

Yours truly,

SAMUEL J. MAY.

LETTER TO PROFESSOR STUART.

NO II.

WILLIAMSBURG, July 1, 1850.

REV. MOSES STUART, ANDOVER:

SIR—In my first letter (18 June) I suggested considerations, fatal—as I think—to your interpretation of the Divine Command, in Deut. 23. 15-16. The absence of any regulation, law, or command, in reference to fugitives from Hebrew Masters—that is, if this command is to be rejected as applying to such cases—is, to my mind, a negative pregnant with mischief to your very narrow and limited view of the extent of the operation of this command. Understand, Sir, I am not prepared to deny that it may cover the case you have assumed, though there is good and sufficient reason to doubt it. For observe, Sir, if your sense of the passage was the received one at the time, what immense dangers would threaten the young Commonwealth of the Hebrews, from this source alone. If in our own times, when the received Law of Nations has settled this point, the case of the Creole fugitives under the skillful management of your friend Daniel Webster, had well nigh drawn us into a war with England, for the very converse of your theory, what wild disorder, long continued, must have ensued from such a law bearing your sense of it? In those days, when the law was young, when the law of Nations was in its infancy, when Society, all over the then known world, was probably little more than Patriarchal (or Chieftain) and clan, and Master and bondman, such a law could only be looked upon by surrounding nations, as intended for their ruin. The Divine origin of this law, they would look upon as a mere pretence (of its divinity they could know nothing) and would view the law, and the Hebrew People, with the same degree of abhorrence, which drove the Nations of Europe to seek refuge in a war of nearly twenty-five years, from the consequences of a declaration—of the same category—of the National Convention of France in the early years of the French Revolution.

Again: Is it not strange if your sense of the passage is the only correct one, that in all the Jewish annals, in the numerous wars in which the Jews were engaged, this law does not appear to have furnished the slightest pretext to their enemies? For forty years—I am told—you have made the study of the Sacred Scriptures your great business; and yet you have not furnished us with a single instance out of them, in corroboration of your theory. My reading of them, has of necessity been much more limited. And if there has been such an instance, I may be permitted without much shame, to say, that it has totally escaped me. And if there be indeed no such instance, sir, is it not strange? Would not "ye seduce my servants" have been among the foremost of the pretences, of an ambitious despot, to cover schemes of conquest and desolation? Is not then the silence of the annals ominous against you? "What will History say" in the matter of the Creole? Will it be equally silent? I trow not. Here, there was no special law inviting the escape of fugitives. Nothing but the settled law of nations, and the claims of crushed and down-trodden humanity on the side of right. It is true, that the stand taken by the law-lords in Parliament was noble and glorious. That stand, and the sentiments then and there uttered will furnish a page for history, which will grow brighter by time, and will fill with generous rapture the breast of many a youthful student of General Law, so long as there is wrong to be endured, and many courage to be trained up for its redress. And yet it is no extravagance or hyperbole to say that all Christendom was held in an agony of suspense from the commencement to the termination of the controversy which grew out of this matter. For though the right was so clearly on the other side, yet such was the daring impudence and insolence of our Slavery Government, with its atrocious claims set forth "with devilish skill" by your great friend, our then Secretary; and, so tame was the course of the British Government, so fearful to offend a good customer, so ready to promise to avoid, if possible, all occasions of being again "naughty," that the suspense was almost insupportable. There is no intelligent man who believes that this case and others of the same kind, will not occupy a prominent place in History, to our lasting disgrace, and very little to the credit of the British Government.

In your exposition of the views of the Legislator, I find the following: "Moses therefore would not suffer the fugitive fugitive to be forced back into the darkness of heathenism nor allow that he should be delivered up to an enraged heathen master." I intend to refer to this again hereafter, and only do so now for the purpose of enquiring whether the Lawgiver could intend more mercy to the foreign fugitive, than to any individual of any one of the three classes of their own servants. Perfect freedom from bondage, and all the privileges of a free man to the foreign escapist, and no vilages of a free man to the runaway Hebrew servant! Does not this strike you as being rather preposterous? We have heard something about enraged masters in the slave States, when they have recovered their fugitives. But there is one case which happened a few years ago in our very midst, the force of which there is no erasing. "I will not," said the master of George Latimer, "meeting him in the streets of Boston. 'I will not destroy

you at once, when I get you home," "but," the fell denunciation of Slavery at once displaying itself in voice gesture and action. "I'll KILL YOU BY INCHES"

Previously you moot the question of a fugitive from a Hebrew master, and enquire who could take from him the property which the Moses Law entitled him to hold? "Reclamation of him" [the fugitive] "could be lawfully made, and therefore must be enforced."

Now in the absence of all proof, I pronounce this "lawfully" a bare assertion on your part, a mere lordly assumption of the whole matter at issue. Point out this law by which he could be lawfully reclaimed, and then you will indeed do something for your side of the argument. Till then we must be excused from trusting in gross assumptions and mere dicta. Meantime, I will give at least one instance how property thus "lawfully" held could as lawfully be taken away.

In Exodus 21. 26-27, there are two of those instances. But I choose the instance in the 27 verse, because it shows the mind of the lawgiver, and brings me nearer to the point at which I am aiming. "If a man strike out his man servant's tooth or his maid servant's tooth he shall let him [or her] go out FREE for his [or her] tooth's sake."

And now for the point at which I have been aiming, namely, the perfect congruity between this positive enactment, which cannot be gainsaid, and the sense in which the command in Deuteronomy is re-ved by Abolitionists, and probably by the great majority of Christians throughout the world. What slaveholder among us would not laugh at the idea of his slave being freed if his master should commit so slight an injury as the knocking out of a tooth, or indeed perpetrating any mutilation whatever? Now if an injury so trifling in our estimate, was by statute necessarily followed by emancipation of the injured party, is it not strictly analogous to infer that the flight of the Hebrew servant from all the previous associations which might render even bondage endurable was such an evidence of general ill usage as to render necessary the command, not to return him to his enraged master?

P. SHAPTER.

### Foreign Correspondence.

From our Dublin Correspondent.

DUBLIN, 9th of June, 1850.

MY DEAR GAY: I have been spending a few hours of this fine, soft, breezy summer's day in rambling, with some friends, on the Hill of Howth, a peninsula which forms the north side of the beautiful Bay of Dublin. Though only nine miles from the city, it is as wild, healthy, rugged and secluded on the side next the open sea as it was thousands of years ago. There is a fine stretch of coast and sea scenery, and the only signs of civilization are a few ships or an occasional steamboat on its way to or from England. The nearest point of the Welsh coast is here about 60 miles distant, but it is never seen except when the weather is unusually clear, and such a state of the atmosphere is, in our climate, always followed by heavy rain. Ours are, indeed, weeping skies. They are more so here than in England, and again less clear in England than on the neighboring continent. Perhaps in no part of the world are the extremes of heat and cold less felt than in Ireland. Last winter we thought severe, and yet the snow never lay more than three days on the ground.

I have lately been amusing myself with Henry Colman's pleasant volumes on "European Life and Manners," which were lent me by a friend just returned from the United States. Have you seen them? They are capital light reading; but they interest me especially, because I knew the author. I had an opportunity of showing him some attention when he first visited Ireland, in 1844; and when he was last in Dublin, he spent some days with us, only about a month before he was carried off by cholera in London. He was a most agreeable and amiable person, with an unaffected gaiety and amenity of manner, which enabled him to make his way, without difficulty or obtrusiveness, into the highest circles in England. It is difficult for an American to have an idea of the strictness with which the different circles of society are defined in Great Britain. And the exclusiveness is so great, generally speaking, that one class know as little of the social habits, prejudices and opinions of the other, as if they were natives of different countries. Very much the same kind of curiosity prevails respecting the private life, moral and social, of our aristocracy, as we feel respecting the natives of Houssa or Abyssinia. Henry Colman, from the excellence of his introductions on coming to England, and from his gentlemanly and prepossessing manners, had peculiar facilities in this respect. His letters are full of the most amusing details respecting the establishments and style of living of our wealthiest and most magnificent nobles. He was every where kindly received, and loaded with attentions, and his book is filled to overflowing with acknowledgments of the very natural gratitude and pleasure excited by this hospitality. He saw English society in its sunniest aspects. Almost every thing is painted *couleur du rose*. You can't help sympathizing with his enjoyment, for, amidst the whirl of invitations to the stately houses, whilst a welcome guest at the most luxurious tables, and in the most select circles (which thousands in these snobbish, tuft-hunting countries would almost give their eyes to enjoy), he found time to visit the sick and the poor, and was by no means blinded, by the glare in which he moved, to the terrible contrasts always to be found in a country like England, where the poor are so poor, and the wealthy so exclusive, grasping and powerful. I hope the kind-hearted old man never saw the reviews of his book that appeared in some of the English journals shortly before his death. They were as spiteful as possible. The writers impressed me with the idea that they were jealous of the etree enjoyed by him into the houses of the aristocracy. They accused him of tuft-hunting and toadyism, and of visiting the great for the purpose of making a book, and betraying the confidence with which he had been received. Nothing could be more unjust. His details are of the most general description; he betrays no confidence, copies no conversations, and exhibits throughout that kindness of heart towards people of all classes, and especially the degraded and the suffering, which was inseparable from his nature. When we last had the pleasure of his company, we were much impressed with his sweetness of spirit. In his cheerful and pleasant conversation, it was always the best thing he could say that he did say of every body. He had just at that time returned from a visit to some of the more distressed districts in the west of Ireland. He was exceedingly impressed with the misery he witnessed. He said he had never seen the extremity of wretchedness till then, and that he should never hereafter complain of anything on his own account. He was suffering, at the time, from ill-health; his sight had greatly failed; and when we heard of his death so soon after, so far from home, amongst strangers, we were not surprised, though it was painful to lose the hope of ever again seeing on earth one who carried with him such a pleasant atmosphere of gentle cheerfulness. In the onslaught which some of the English publishers are now making on all American copyrights, we shall doubtless shortly have Mr. Colman's Letters in a shilling volume, and in this shape it will probably obtain a large circulation.

But I have said so much, at this time, about this book and its author, on account of the extraordinary contrast presented by its pages with another work lately published, which contains terrible revelations of the brutal ignorance, social wretchedness, and moral degradation of the peasantry in very many of the agricultural and mining districts of England and Wales. It is entitled "The social Condition and Education of the People of England and Europe, showing the results of the Primary Schools and the Division of Landed Property in Foreign Countries." The main object of the author, Joseph Kay, Esq., a barrister, is to advo-

cate the importance of a system of State education, and the necessity of so modifying the laws which regulate the distribution of landed property in England, that the great estates may be in a degree broken up, and the tillers of the soil have a chance of attaining that position of peasant proprietors which prevailed, to some extent, about 1000 years ago, but has now almost disappeared in Great Britain. The recent establishment of such a class in Denmark, and many parts of Prussia, he describes as having been followed by the most beneficial results. His pictures of the worse than heathen ignorance, the more than savage pollution and brutality, the deadness to all natural feelings existing among the rural population in many parts of England and Wales, exceed any thing I had supposed to exist among any people. Here, in Ireland, our peasantry are often grossly superstitious and very ignorant, and the vice of mendacity is shockingly prevalent. But their social affections are generally warm, their sense of propriety strong, and the absence of prodigality, considering the miserable and crowded dwellings they occupy, is quite remarkable. In short, if Mr. Kay's evidence, which appears to have been collected with great industry and disinterestedness, be correct, the peasantry of Ireland are in a more hopeful state, as to intelligence, morals and manners, than those of the wealthier island, with all her riches, power, and boasted civilization. In England, multitudes of the people are not only destitute of all literary, moral or religious instruction, but utterly indifferent to education. In Ireland, they have, at least, the priests for moral instructors, and a decided love for learning prevails amongst them. Popery gives an uncertain light; extremely dim where it is unopposed; brighter when it comes into collision and competition with Protestantism; but, at any rate, better than the utter darkness that prevails where no teaching whatever is administered.

I heard some whispers that Colman's Letters were not altogether grateful to some of his aristocratic friends in England. If this be true, I can only attribute their dissatisfaction to the pictures he portrays of boundless wealth and its inevitable concomitant, a laborious ingenuity in getting rid of money, which cannot but affect the public mind disagreeably. Every right-thinking person feels the rottenness of a state of society in which the laws so regulate the distribution of property that a few are enabled to revel in every conceivable luxury, whilst myriads of the working classes are deprived of education, huddled together like pigs, their minds in total darkness, and their hearts hardened and hopeless with poverty. By suggesting ideas of this kind, Henry Colman may prove a dangerous guest to his kind entertainers; for his book contains much plain talk, and evinces a strong sense of the real state of things in England. He declares, in one letter, that democratic principles are rapidly advancing, and that the aristocracy are evidently powerless against its more vehement manifestations.

I have just heard that my friends, whom I recommended to your kind notice sometime since, have arrived safely in America, after a rapid voyage of 21 days, by the New World, Captain Knight. They speak in the highest terms of the ship, her captain, and her crew of brave, steady, American, temperance sailors. They stopped only one night in New York, and their letter was dated from Buffalo. If wishing could do any good, I would wish you a million such settlers, or that we had a million like them, in place of as many who remain at home, sunk in hopeless depths of beggary, idleness and pauperism.

The account of the suppression of your annual meeting by the New York mob, with the passive assistance of the New York authorities, as given in the Tribune, is a graphic fragment of true history. It is one of those fragments which, after ages, will find a difficulty in accepting for truth; it will be such a humiliating picture of the "wisdom of their ancestors." Our own ancestors were, after all, neither better nor wiser in grain than our foolish selves. These Pro-slavery, American mobs, filled with drunken zeal for religion, the Union, the constitution, and the aristocracy of the skin, remind one of the Church and King mobs in England, in George the Third's time, when ignorant and degraded wretches destroyed Dr. Priestley's library and philosophical apparatus, and hunted himself out of England, all for the love of God and "the honor and dignity of the crown." I know it has been said that this mob violence is alarming and disgusting to all respectable people; that the suppression of the Anti-Slavery anniversary was the work of a few ruffians, and that the authorities alone are to blame for their supineness. But it is clear that Rynders and his crew have powerful backers, who are determined that the tide of Anti-Slavery discussion shall be kept out by their besoms, if possible. The American Union may be likened to a patient afflicted with a bad cancer. The Abolitionists think that the only chance for life is to remove the sore by a bold operation, and they keep dinning their conviction in the ears of the rest of the community. But these—although they dislike cancers "as much as any body," and although all past experience is against them—maintain that the best way to get rid of this particular cancer is to let it alone, to apply no remedy, to say nothing about it, and, by and by, it will drop out of itself, leaving the patient as sound as a bell. They hate surgery, with all its disagreeable concomitants, and they also hate all tireome people who persist in recommending this irksome operation. Like a crew of drunken sailors on a dangerous coast, they shut their eyes to the danger, make as merry as possible while life lasts, and cannot bear to be bored by the warnings of captain or pilot.

By this post I send you a Weekly Dispatch, containing a capital leader on the character of the mind and writings of Thomas Carlyle. It is well worthy of a place on the fourth page of the Standard.

Yours truly,

RICHARD D. WEBB.

### CONGRESSIONAL.

We copy below a report of two interesting debates of some interest in Congress last week, and intended to have published also Mr. Seward's last speech on Slavery, but are obliged to defer it for want of room till next week. His friends are loud in its praise.

SENATE.—WASHINGTON, Wednesday, July 3.

MR. WALKER presented resolutions adopted by a meeting of the citizens of Wilmington, Delaware, against the Omnibus bill. In the course of some remarks against the Omnibus bill, he said he was well satisfied that separate legislation upon the subjects embraced in the bill, was the best course, and such would be the course finally adopted, thus intimating that his own vote would be against the measure.

MR. CLAY said he had received a letter from a distinguished citizen of Delaware, stating that the Resolutions were adopted only by a very small majority. He expressed his firm conviction, that the citizens of Delaware, as well as the whole country would be found almost unanimous in favor of the bill.

MR. WALKER regretted that the Senator from Kentucky had undertaken upon a single letter, to give the Senate a false and untrue character and view of the meeting in question, so different from that which the proceedings presented to the Senate. He then proceeded to state some facts to show that Delaware was not so unanimous in favor of the Compromise. Among other facts he stated that a petition circulated in Kent county in favor of the resolution was torn and destroyed.

After the consideration of the morning business, the resolution prohibiting the exercise of civil authority by military officers of the United States, and providing punishment for such crimes, was taken up.

MR. HORTON resumed his remarks in his remarks in denunciation of Monroe's action in New Mexico, charging it as the act of the President, and charging the Executive with being actuated and controlled by prejudice against the State of Texas, which had betrayed itself in his military as well as his Executive career.

to its support, he must say that as the bill was reported to the Senate, or in the shape in which it now was, he was quite indifferent to its success; he could not see that the bill would settle anything—how could he be expected to rely with confidence simply upon the official reports of the members of the House? As he led in support of the bill that it would give peace to the country. It seemed to him to be a mere expedient of a day or mere palliation; although he must say that he would hesitate long before he decided to reject the measure. The Senator from Kentucky had taken the President to task for not having modified his views expressed on the 24th of January last so as to take in the report of the Committee. He (Bell) would only say that if he desired to make an issue with the President, he certainly would not arraign him for not agreeing to so questionable a measure as this. He expressed his regret that he had early in the session presented a series of resolutions combining several measures, as that act would embarrass him somewhat in the course which he might feel it his duty to pursue upon the present bill.

MR. CLAY in the course of some intercollocatory remarks said it was in the mouths of every Member of Congress, that if the President had either come out in favor of the bill or remained silent upon it, it would have passed both Houses of Congress. He well knew the influence of the Executive's known views had; he had heard the writer of the newspaper calling the bill "ridiculous," "the Omnibus," and then it was that he felt called upon to vindicate the measure against a thousand Presidents. (Applause in the galleries.)

MR. BELL inquired if the President was to have no opinions because they would be influential. Did the Senator not know that in respect to control over the House, the President was his master? MR. JEFFERSON DAVIS desired to deny for himself that he should have gone for the bill except for the influence of the President. Those with whom he acted against this measure were under no such control; he did not believe that any such effective Executive influence had been exercised or existed.

MR. BELL after some further remarks gave way to a motion to postpone the further consideration of the bill until Friday next, which was agreed to. The Senate then adjourned to Friday.

HOUSE.—WASHINGTON, Friday, July 5.

MR. GIDDINGS rose to a question of privilege and proposed the *Boston Atlas*, in which was an article or letter by the writer of the newspaper calling the bill "ridiculous," "the Omnibus," and then it was that he felt called upon to vindicate the measure against a thousand Presidents. (Applause in the galleries.)

MR. JONES denied that this could be a question of privilege; it was entirely between the newspaper editor, or the author of the article, and the gentleman charged with improper conduct.

The Speaker referred to two charges made against members in the Twenty-ninth and Thirtieth Congress, and in these instances it was left for the House to determine whether they were questions of privilege, and the same course should be pursued on the present occasion.

MR. TOOMBS appealed from the decision of the Chair, and said that the Speaker should make a decision, and in the case of the letter-writer against Mr. Sawyer (of sausage memory).

MR. TOOMBS said the privileges of members are defined in the Constitution; none of these had been violated by the writer of the newspaper article. As the newspapers, they utter threats and falsehoods, and charge crimes against every member of the House, and the gentleman from Ohio would be fortunate if he escaped.

MR. STEVENS of Penn. inquired on what ground of privilege the House took action with reference to the Secretary of War on the Galpin claim.

MR. TOOMBS replied, the Secretary asked an investigation. It was not a question of privilege—no one contended it was. In conclusion, he contended that this was not a question of privilege as contemplated by the Constitution.

MR. BAKER was opposed to any investigation, because the article did not bring in question Mr. Giddings's privilege as a member of Congress. Mr. Sawyer was accused of a breach of faith. [A Voice—No, eating sausage.] It was against the dignity of the House, involving the conduct of a member while in the discharge of his public duties, and causing delay. A letter writer abused the courtesy accorded to him by the House.

MR. SWEETSER was understood to desire an investigation of the charges. His colleague had been charged with abstracting papers in his official capacity as a member of Congress.

MR. HILLIARD concurred in the opinion expressed by Mr. Toombs. The article was anonymous; no one was responsible for it, and the House was called on to enter into an investigation, simply because the gentleman occupied a seat in the hall. He moved the previous question on the appeal.

MR. BURT desired to know whether the letter was written by a letter writer, or reporter, having the privilege of access to the Speaker's chamber.

The Speaker said it was not in order to make remarks on the subject.

The House then took a vote and refused to second the demand for the previous question.

MR. HARRIS, (of Illinois) said, it was for the House to say what it was the duty of the Speaker to do, and it was no part of the Speaker's duty to decide such questions.

MR. VANDYKE moved to lay the appeal on the table.

MR. BAKER asked the unanimous consent of the House to make an explanation. Objection was interposed.

MR. HILLIARD moved the grounds for his decision, that the House should determine whether this was a question of privilege. The appeal from the decision of the Chair was then laid on the table.

MR. ALLEN contended that the House had power to investigate the charges. It only rested on the motion of Mr. Giddings, but on the House itself.

MR. MCCLERNAND was in favor of investigation. Mr. Giddings had been charged with felony, and should have an opportunity to vindicate himself.

MR. MORSE would not undertake to draw distinctions between the charges of Mr. Giddings or Mr. Hilliard, whether the charge was by the editor or a correspondent, or whether it was made against a member in official or private capacity. If the charge was made against a member of this House in his official capacity it was no breach of privilege, and the House had no right to inquire into it.

MR. HILLIARD moved to lay the appeal on the table.

MR. BAKER asked the unanimous consent of the House to make an explanation. Objection was interposed.

MR. HILLIARD moved the grounds for his decision, that the House should determine whether this was a question of privilege. The appeal from the decision of the Chair was then laid on the table.

MR. STEWART contended that the House could do nothing less than to order Mr. Giddings to appear, and to abide his testimony; if guilty, he was not fit to represent his constituents and to associate with gentlemen.

MR. WOODWARD discussed the ground taken by Mr. Toombs, that the House had no privileges except such as are expressed in the Constitution or by Laws.

MR. HILLIARD moved to lay the appeal on the table.

MR. HILLIARD moved to lay the appeal on the table.

MR. HILLIARD moved to lay the appeal on the table.

MR. BAKER inquired what was the effect of the vote. The Speaker said that nothing was now before the House.

MR. GIDDINGS asked leave to make a statement with reference to the subject; there being no objection, he made a statement, during which, he said he had never seen the papers connected with the appointment, or the removal of the Postmaster at Oberlin, nor knew a single name of them. He never called on the Assistant Postmaster-General, and in relation to Post-Offices in his own District—so far as Oberlin was concerned, the charge was entirely unfounded.

MR. BAKER inquired whether there was reason to believe the imputation came from the Post-Office Department.

MR. GIDDINGS could not say where it came from. On Wednesday last he found on his desk a paper called the *Day Book*, containing an extract from the *Courier and Enquirer*, making the charges. He put that in a letter to Assistant Postmaster-General Warren, asking him whether he authorized the publication. He had not received an answer. Yesterday he received the *Boston Atlas* of July 2, containing similar letters, and he wrote a letter to the Editor, demanding the name of the correspondent. He had received no answer. He had only, from Pittsburgh, written a letter to the brother of this Postmaster, at Oberlin, saying that he was compelled to do this. He repeated, he knew no more about the names connected with the papers than the child unborn, and it was inconceivable to him why the imputations should have been made.

MR. OLDS understood his colleague had been charged with franking the papers alleged to have been taken from the Post-Office at Oberlin.

MR. GIDDINGS replied—so far as he knew, he had never permitted his frank to be used for any such purpose. He then made further remarks and thanked the House for the courtesy extended to him.

The House then resumed the consideration of the Galpin claim.

MR. KING, of N. J., and MR. CONRAD, of La., spoke in justification of allowance of principal and interest on the claim. The latter defended the Secretary of War from the taint of official or private misconduct.

The House then adjourned.

### General Intelligence.

Among the passengers arrived by the Washington, were Mr. James, the celebrated novelist, and his family.

Homestead exemption laws have been passed in New York, Main, Ohio, Georgia, Texas, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, and California.

KOSSUTH.—(We Tribune,) are glad to learn from Count Dembinski, that Kossuth intends coming to this country, with his family, as soon as he shall be permitted to leave Turkey.

Mrs. L. M. Child, the well known authoress, has taken up her residence at Brooklyn, where she is devoting herself to an elaborate history of all the past and present religions of the world.

KAH-GE-GAR-BOWH (George Cowper), sails on Wednesday next for Europe, in the *Cambray*. He goes out as Delegate to the Peace Convention, to be held in Frankfurt-on-the-Main.

STRAWBERRIES.—During four days of last week 175,000 baskets of Strawberries—making an aggregate weight of *twenty-one and a half tons*—arrived in this City by the Erie Railroad.

PEACE CONGRESS.—At the Convention of the friends of Peace, held in this city on the 23d inst., Nathaniel Barney, Esq. of Nantucket, was appointed a Delegate to represent that Congressional District in the Peace Congress, and Rev. Amos A. Phelps was chosen as the representative from this city. Rev. Moses G. Thomas was appointed a substitute for either or both of the first named gentlemen. [New Bedford Mercury.]

SLAVE SUIT IN INDIANA.—John Norris of Boone county, Ky. recovered a judgment of \$2,800 against Nathan Crocker and others last week, in the U. S. Circuit Court at Indianapolis, for slaves which they had forcibly taken from Norris, at South Bend, Ind. Norris had followed his runaway negroes to that place, and recovered them, but they were again taken from him. The costs of



